

REMARKS

In the Advisory Action, the Examiner maintained the rejection of claims 13-20 under 35 USC § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Fahlman in view of U.S. Patent 4,882,752 (issued Nov. 21, 1989; hereinafter Lindman). The Applicant respectfully traverses the rejections of claims 13 – 20 and submits the following arguments. Additionally, the Applicant has added new claim 30 and submits arguments in support of patentability.

Claims 13 - 20

In claim 13, the Applicant recites a method for use in a multi-level secure system for sanitizing a message. The method includes steps of establishing a computer-based sanitization tool for sanitizing messages based on predefined sanitization rules, using the computer-based sanitization tool to receive a message for potential distribution, and operating the computer-based sanitization tool to identify at least first and second potential recipients having first and second security clearances, respectively. For example, some users may be associated with a first security level whereas others are associated with a second security level that do not have access to certain information that the first security level users have.

The method further includes a step of operating the computer-based sanitization tool to sanitize a received message and generate a first sanitized message for transmission to the first potential recipient. The method also includes a step of operating the computer-based sanitization tool for sanitizing the received message to generate a second sanitized message for transmission to the second potential recipient. This second message differs from the first sanitized message in that the first sanitized message contains information that the second potential recipient is not allowed to receive.

As the Examiner stated in his previous Office Actions, Fahlman does not teach operating a computer-based tool for identifying first and second potential recipients having first and second security clearances, respectively. The Applicant agrees and further notes that Fahlman does not, in fact, teach using the computer-based tool to identify anyone, nor does Fahlman teach operating a computer-based sanitization tool for sanitizing a received message to generate first and second sanitized messages that differ based on respective first and second security levels. Nor does Fahlman teach first and second sanitized messages.

While Fahlman does not teach generating multiple messages respectively based on

multiple security levels, Lindman again certainly adds nothing to Fahlman to teach such features. The Examiner states that “Lindman’s security system before any communication takes place clearance at several security levels has to be identified, therefore Lindman teaches identifying first and second security clearance (see column 4, lines 1 - 17)”. In column 4, lines 1 - 17, Lindman teaches slave devices that attempt to gain access to a master device. Prior to granting access, the master device determines whether the slave devices have the proper security level to access the master device. Such differs from the Applicant’s claims because, among other reasons, the Applicant does not claim devices that access the sanitized message from a master device. Rather, the Applicant claims a computer-based sanitization tool that identifies a potential recipient and sanitizes the message for delivery to that recipient.

As stated in the Applicant’s previous response, Lindman teaches computer systems having different security levels that access a main computer through a master security control processor (“SCP”). The SCP acts as a sort of gatekeeper to the main computer to prevent other computers from unauthorized access (*see e.g.*, column 8, lines 24 - 30 of Lindman). This control is based on identification of an accessing computer’s security level. Nowhere, however, does Lindman teach identifying sensitive information.

The Applicant again points out to the Examiner that to establish a *prima facie* case obviousness, the Examiner must show that all of the claim limitations of the Applicant’s claims are taught. Additionally, there must be some reasonable suggestion or motivation, either in the references themselves or in the knowledge generally available to one of ordinary skill in the art, to modify the reference or to combine reference teachings. Finally, there must be a reasonable expectation of success in the combination. The Applicant maintains that Fahlman is deficient not only with respect to what the Examiner states but also because Fahlman does not teach generating first and second sanitized messages. It is clear that Lindman adds nothing to supplement Fahlman’s deficiencies as the Examiner suggests. But it is also true that Lindman adds nothing to supplement Fahlman with respect to generating to sanitized messages. Regardless, Lindman provides no teaching or reasonable suggestion to combine with Fahlman.

The Applicant maintains that Lindman provides no teaching or reasonable suggestion to combine with Fahlman, a reference which is almost 10 years younger. In the Advisory Action, the Examiner states that column 8, lines 24-40 of Lindman teaches such a suggestion. Here, Lindman states “Master SCP 16A and slave SCPs 16B and 16C are programmed to implement

and operate in a plurality of security levels to prevent unauthorized access to central computer 14 from remote terminals 12B and 12C. Access to central computer 14 from remote terminals 12B or 12C is permitted only when proper security level clearances are granted and maintained. In the event that the requisite security level clearances are not granted or maintained, one of several different unauthorized access modes can be entered by master SCP 16A or slave SCPs 16B and 16C. Any combination of the below described security levels can be implemented before data communications between central computer 14 and remote terminals 12B and 12C are established. These security levels can also be implemented as desired after data communications have been established to ensure that security is maintained.” Again, the Applicant maintains that Fahlman and Lindman are directed towards different fields. For example, Fahlman is directed to message transformation whereas Lindman is directed to computer security. Thus, Fahlman and Lindman are *non analogous arts* and could not possibly be motivation or suggestion to combine. Because there is no teaching or reasonable suggestion to combine the references and because the references do not teach all of the Applicant’s claim elements, Fahlman and Lindman are simply insufficient as prior art references.

Claims 14 - 20 depend from claim 13 and inherit all of the novel and nonobvious features of the independent claim. However, these claims require additional features that further distinguish from the cited references. For example, claim 15 recites that the step of third operating comprises accessing storage including multiple rule sets, using a parameter associated with the first security clearance to select a first rule sets, and applying the selected first rule set with respect to that message to generate a first sanitized message. While Fahlman clearly does not teach such as the Examiner points out, the Examiner states that Lindman does in column 8, lines 65 - 68; column 9, lines 1 - 8; and column 10, lines 16 to 49. The Applicant respectfully disagrees. Here, Lindman teaches that slave devices merely have identification codes that the master SCP compares to stored identification codes so as to grant or deny access to the slave devices. However, Lindman does not teach or reasonably suggest, among other things, selecting or applying a rule set that is associated with a security clearance. As such, Lindman is deficient as a reference. For at least these reasons, claim 15 is novel and nonobvious in view of the cited references. The Applicant, therefore, respectfully requests reconsideration and allowance of claim 15.

In another example of novelty and nonobviousness, claim 19 recites a step of third

operating comprising identifying a first format associated with the first potential recipient and converting the first sanitized message into the first format. The Examiner states that Fahlman teaches such in column 3, lines 56 - 60; column 4, lines 64 - 65, and column 5, lines 1 - 17 which merely states "...the sanitized message is transmitted in step 209 to an untrusted service for required service...". Again, the Applicant respectfully disagrees. In particular, the Applicant fails to see how the *transmission* of Fahlman equates to *conversion* of a sanitized message into a first format (e.g., a process of formatting). In any case, Fahlman does not even use the word "format" once in the entire patent. Nor does Lindman teach or reasonably suggest formatting. For at least these reasons, claim 19 is novel and nonobvious in view of the cited references. The Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and allowance of claim 19.

Similar arguments may also be made for claim 20 because, among other reasons, claim 20 also recites formatting of sanitized messages (e.g., a second format for a third external system, first and second specification information used in formatting, etc.). Additionally, claim 20 includes accessing storage to obtain the first and second specification information. Again, Fahlman and Lindman do not teach or reasonably suggest, either alone or in combination, formatting, specification information, and/or accessing storage of the Applicant's claims. For at least these reasons, claim 20 is also novel and nonobvious in view of the cited references. The Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and allowance of claim 20.

Claim 30

In claim 30, the Applicant recites a method for use in a multi-level secure system for sanitizing a message. The method includes the steps of receiving an input file that includes information associated with at least first and second security levels of the multi-level secure system, wherein a user associated with said first security level of the multi-level secure system is entitled to receive information that a user associated with said second security level of the multi-level secure system is not entitled to receive, determining a security level associated with at least one user of the multi-level secure system to be said second security level and parsing intelligible elements from the information of the input file. The method also includes the steps of analyzing said intelligible elements to select a portion of the intelligible elements for sanitization according to the second security level, sanitizing the information of the selected portion of the intelligible elements according to the second security level to generate an output file for said at least one user of the multi-level secure system, wherein said output file has a first format. Additionally, the

method includes the steps of formatting the output file to a second format for said at least one user of the multi-level secure system and transferring the output file in the second format to said at least one user of the multi-level secure system.

Claim 30 is patentable because, among other reasons, Fahlman does not teach either parsing or formatting. Nor does Lindman supplement Fahlman in this regard. For example, parsing generally regards determining portions of an electronic file that constitute text and extracting that text from the file. In this regard, sanitization may include locating text in an image file and extracting that text from the image file for sanitization thereof. Fahlman does not teach any type of parsing like the Applicant claims. Nor does Lindman supplement Fahlman to teach that which the Applicant claims.

In regards to formatting, the Applicant recites formatting the output file to a second format for said at least one user of the multi-level secure system and transferring the output file in the second format to said at least one user of the multi-level secure system (i.e., converting a document from one format to another, like converting a Microsoft Word document to a PDF document). Fahlman does not teach any type of document conversion like the Applicant claims. Nor does Lindman supplement Fahlman to teach that which the Applicant claims.

Because Fahlman and Lindman do not teach parsing or formatting of the applicant's claims, either alone or in combination, Fahlman and Lindman fail to teach all elements of the Applicant's claims as required. For at least these reasons, the Applicant believes claim 30 is in condition for allowance and respectfully requests such disposition.

CONCLUSION

Based upon the foregoing, the Applicant believes that all pending claims are in condition for allowance and such disposition is respectfully requested. In the event that a telephone conversation would further prosecution and/or expedite allowance, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned.

Respectfully submitted,

MARSH FISCHMANN & BREYFOGLE LLP

By: 

Gregory T. Fettig
Registration No. 50,843
3151 South Vaughn Way, Suite 411
Aurora, Colorado 80014
Telephone: 720-562-5509

Date: April 21, 2006